UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,348	01/04/2005	Toru Ikuta	2224-0237PUS1	5464
	7590 04/20/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 3/A 22040 0747	KNABLE, GEOFFREY L		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1791		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/20/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/520,348	IKUTA, TORU		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Geoffrey L. Knable	1791		

	Geoffiey L. Kriable	1791					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 10 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Co	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth interest for the date set for the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	r).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	iled within two month:	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
(b) ⊠ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	octed claims					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)		cted claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (DTOL -324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Americanient (101-324).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	''						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 2, 4/2, 5/2, 6/2, 7/2, 8/2, 12/2, 13/12/2, Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1,3,4/1,4/3,5/1,5/3		3/12/1,14/12/1,15/12.					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		_					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>1/21/200</u>	<u>09</u>					
	/Geoffrey L. Knable/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1791					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment to claim 2, lines 3-4 raises several new issues requiring further consideration and/or search. First, newly defining that the reinforcing layer is "formed on the internal surface of the tire body" raises new issues. Further, newly defining that the reinforcing layer comprises a "resin layer" raises new issues including potential issues of lack of description/new matter as it is not clear that the original disclosure clearly supports the reinforcing layer being described as a "resin layer" - in other words, the term "reinforcing layer" in the tire art is generally read as being inclusive of cord/textile layers whereas this new reference to a "resin layer" is apparently intended to define the resin member in a manner that it distinguishes a textile/cord reinforcing layer. It however is not clear that original descriptive support exist for this (the term "resin layer" does not appear to have been used in the original disclosure). Further, with the amendment to claim 2, claim 5 dependent upon claim 2 raises new issues including issues of lack of descriptive support as the original disclosure seems to distinguish the resin member forming a "reinforcing layer" and the resin member forming an "adhesive layer" - in other words, the original disclosure does not clearly describe the resin member being a reinforcing layer that is also an adhesive layer as now defined by claim 5 dependent upon claim 2 as amended.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record, the arguments principally pertaining to the matter that raises new issues..